

Remarks

Applicant thanks Examiner Balsis for conducting the Applicant initiated interview on June 22, 2006. During the interview, proposed amendments to independent claims 1 and 9 were discussed. By the present paper, then, the Applicant adopts the proposed amendments.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application upon entry of this paper. Claims 16-20 were previously withdrawn. Of the pending claims, claims 1-7 and 9-14 were rejected, claim 1 was objected to for an informality and claims 8 and 15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. By this paper, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, for example, in the specification at page 6 lines 4-14 and in FIG- 1. Support for the amendment to claim 9 may be found, for example, in the specification at page 9 lines 9-21 and in FIG- 5. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to for an informality. By this paper, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to remove a minor typographical error. Accordingly, the objection is believed to be obviated.

Claims 8 and 15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9 from which claims 8 and 15 depend, respectively. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully contends that the objection has been obviated as the base claims are believed to be patentable, as amended.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over webpage “#3956-01 Var.-Speed MultiPro® Kit w/Flex-Shaft” herein referred to as “Dremel” in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,210,261 issued to Johnson (hereinafter “Johnson”).

Independent Claim 1

In the final Office Action mailed May 2, 2006, the Examiner relied on arbor flexibility (i.e., flex-shaft) to make the cleaning member capable of contacting the spindle of the machine tool. *See* final Office Action mailed May 2, 2006 at page 2. The Applicant believes that the present invention is patentable over the prior art and has amended independent claim 1 to further define therover. In particular, and as discussed during the June 22, 2006 Applicant initiated interview, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to claim a rigid arbor. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, for example, in the specification at page 6 lines 4-14 and in FIG- 1. Accordingly, no new matter has been added and the Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection has been overcome.

Independent Claim 9

In the final Office Action mailed May 2, 2006, the Examiner labeled a component of the Dremel as a fixture. *See* final Office Action mailed May 2, 2006 at page 3 and the unlabeled, marked-up drawing of the Dremel provided by the Examiner. The Applicant believes that the present invention is patentable over the prior art and has amended independent claim 9 to further define therover. As discussed during the June 22, 2006 Applicant initiated interview, the Applicant has amended independent claim 9 to further define the fixture and the fixture’s relation to the support plate. Support for the amendment to claim 9 may be found, for example, in the specification at page 9 lines 9-21 and in FIG- 5. Accordingly, no new matter has been added and the Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection has been overcome.

Dependent Claims

Regarding claims which depend from independent claims 1 and 9, Applicant contends that these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 9 are patentable. Moreover, Applicant contends that these claims recite further limitations, in addition to the limitations of claims 1 and 9, which render these claims additionally patentable.

Conclusion

Applicant has made a genuine effort to respond to the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicant believes all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 06-1510.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to discuss prompt resolution of any remaining issues necessary to place this case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE NORDSTROM et al.

By Timothy J. Marsh
Timothy J. Marsh
Reg. No. 56,684
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: June 29, 2006

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351